



Ifw

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Attorney Docket No. 2006\_0570A  
Koichi HASEGAWA et al. : **Confirmation No. 1683**  
Serial No. 10/575,725 : Group Art Unit 1793  
Filed April 13, 2006 : Examiner Janell Combs Morillo  
SPUTTERING TARGET MATERIAL : **Mail Stop: RCE**

**SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This supplements the response filed on July 6, 2009, which is now entered as a result of the RCE filed on July 31, 2009.

Accordingly, the claims are now 17 to 26, with claims 17 to 21 being independent claims directed to a sputtering target material for forming a thin film of high reflectance and claims 22 to 26 being directed to the corresponding thin films.

In the Advisory Action of July 21, 2009, the Examiner pointed to the absence of evidence of unexpected results over the prior art. Such evidence is submitted herewith and, in the remarks below, such evidence will be discussed.

Applicants reply to the first rejection of claims 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hensel et al. and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Hensel et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Hensel et al. disclose Ag as a base alloy, with the addition of a small percentage of P and with the further addition, as optional ingredients, of Pt, Pd, Ni, Co or Fe.

This reference is perhaps more relevant to claims 17 and 18 than the other claims.

Claim 17 recites an Ag base alloy containing specified small amounts of P, Cu and Bi.